

Ramsey M. Al-Salam, Bar No. 109506
 Christina J. McCullough, Bar No. 245944
 Antoine M. McNamara, Bar No. 261980
 Stevan R. Stark, admitted *pro hac vice*
 R. Tyler Kendrick, admitted *pro hac vice*
 Jessica J. Delacenserie, admitted *pro hac vice*
 PERKINS COIE LLP
 1201 Third Avenue, Suite 4900
 Seattle, WA 98101
 Tel: 206.359.8000 / Fax: 206.359.9000
 RAlsalam@perkinscoie.com
 CMcCullough@perkinscoie.com
 AMcNamara@perkinscoie.com
 SStark@perkinscoie.com
 RKendrick@perkinscoie.com
 JDelacenserie@perkinscoie.com

Daniel T. Shvodian, Bar No. 184576
 PERKINS COIE LLP
 3150 Porter Drive
 Palo Alto, CA 94304-1212
 Tel: 650.838.4300 / Fax: 650.737.5461
 DShvodian@perkinscoie.com

Daniel T. Keese, Bar No. 280683
 PERKINS COIE LLP
 1120 NW Couch Street, 10th Floor
 Portland, OR 97209-4128
 Tel: 503-727-2000 / Fax: 503-727-2222
 DKeese@perkinscoie.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff Impinj, Inc.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

IMPINJ, INC.,

Plaintiff,

v.

NXP USA, INC.,

Defendant.

Case No. 4:19-cv-03161-YGR

**IMPINJ, INC.'S REPLY IN SUPPORT OF
 ITS MOTION FOR ADMINISTRATIVE
 MOTION TO RECONVENE JURY**

Hearing Date: July 25, 2023

Without Oral Argument

Judge: Hon. Yvonne Gonzalez Rogers

Impinj, Inc. has moved to reconvene the jury to avoid the possibility of an unnecessary
 second trial on the obviousness or non-obviousness of the claims of the '302 patent. The parties

1 agree that the jury verdict is inconsistent, and NXP has made clear that it intends to seek a new
2 trial on the issue and has cited authority for its motion. Opp. at 2. Impinj believes that NXP has
3 waived its right to seek such relief by failing to raise the issue before the jury was discharged.
4 More specifically, the issue of waiver turns on whether the jury verdict was a *general* or *special*
5 verdict. See, e.g., *Home Indem. Co. v. Lane Powell Moss and Miller*, 43 F.3d 1322, 1331 (9th Cir.
6 1995) (“We conclude that the district court properly refused to amend the judgment because Home
7 waived its objection to the jury’s verdict on its contribution claim by not objecting to the alleged
8 inconsistency prior to the dismissal of the jury.”); *Duhn Oil Tool, Inc. v. Cooper Cameron Corp.*,
9 818 F. Supp. 2d 1193, 1219 (E.D. Cal. 2011), *reconsidered on other grounds*, No. 05-CV-1411-
10 MLH (GSA), 2012 WL 13040409 (E.D. Cal. May 17, 2012) (discussing that waiver applies for to
11 general verdicts but not special verdicts). The Ninth Circuit has held that a court does not have
12 “authority to grant a new trial on the basis of legally irreconcilable general verdicts.” *Duhn Oil*,
13 *supra* at 1220 (citing *Zhang v. Am. Gem Seafoods, Inc.*, 339 F.3d 1020, 1231 (9th Cir. 2003)).

14 Accordingly, the issue turns on whether the jury verdict in the instant case should be
15 considered general or special. In *Function Media, LLC v. Google Inc.*, 708 F.3d 1310 (Fed. Cir.
16 2013), the Federal Circuit held a verdict equivalent to that of the instant case was a *general* verdict.
17 See *id.* at 1329-30 (holding that questions of whether defendant had proven by clear and convincing
18 evidence that specific claims were anticipated or obvious was a general verdict, subject to waiver
19 for failure to object prior to dismissal of jury). As the court held there, it would “be improper to
20 allow [plaintiff] to now argue inconsistencies require an entirely new trial when it failed to object
21 at the only time when an inconsistency could have been cured.” *Id.* at 1330; but see *Duhn Oil*,
22 *supra* at 1220 (holding that irreconcilable findings on obviousness of independent and dependent
23 claims warranted new trial despite apparent waiver).

24 But to the extent the Court wants to avoid the possibility of a new trial, it should reconvene
25 the jury because the jury was confused regarding how to judge obviousness of dependent claims,
26 in part because *there was no jury instruction on the difference between dependent and independent*
27 *claims*. Had the jury understood that the limitations of the independent claim were incorporated
28

1 into the dependent claims, it would have reached the same conclusions for claims 4 and 7, as it did
2 for claims 1 and 3.

3 NXP argues it is too late to reconvene the jury, because they have been “freed from their
4 obligations to remain insulated from prejudicial sources of information, to avoid talking to non-
5 jurors about the case, and to maintain focus on the key facts, arguments and instruction from the
6 Court.” Op. at 2. But the Court can poll each juror on these issues. While it might be too late, it
7 would be better to see if that is the case rather than simply assume it to be so. Impinj is confident
8 that, if polled, the jurors will explain had they understood the dependent claims included all the
9 limitations of the independent claims, they would have found that there was no clear and
10 convincing evidence of obviousness.

1 Respectfully submitted:

2 July 21, 2023

3 By: /s/ Ramsey M. Al-Salam

4 Ramsey M. Al-Salam, Bar No. 109506
5 Christina J. McCullough, Bar No. 245944
6 Antoine M. McNamara, Bar No. 261980
7 R. Tyler Kendrick (admitted *pro hac vice*)
8 Jessica J. Delacenserie (admitted *pro hac vice*)
9 PERKINS COIE LLP
10 1201 Third Avenue, 49th Floor
11 Seattle, WA 98101
12 Tel: 206.359.8000/Fax: 206.359.9000
13 RAlSalam@perkinscoie.com
14 CMcCullough@perkinscoie.com
15 AMcNamara@perkinscoie.com
16 RKendrick@perkinscoie.com
17 JDelacenserie@perkinscoie.com

18 Daniel T. Shvodian, Bar No. 184576
19 PERKINS COIE LLP
20 3150 Porter Drive
21 Palo Alto, CA 94304
22 Tel: 650.838.4300/Fax: 650.737.5461
23 DShvodian@perkinscoie.com

24 Daniel T. Keese, Bar No. 280683
25 PERKINS COIE LLP
26 1120 N.W. Couch Street, 10th Floor
27 Portland, OR 97209-4128
28 Tel: 503.727.2000/Fax: 503.727.2222
DKeese@perkinscoie.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff Impinj, Inc.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that a true and correct copy of the above and foregoing document has been served via U.S. District Court CM/ECF notification on July 21, 2023 to all counsel of record.

/s/ Ramsey M. Al-Salam

Ramsey M. Al-Salam